OPEN ACCESS Int. J. Agr. Ext. (2021). 71-79 | Special Issue DOI: 10.33687/ijae.009.00.3723

Check for updates

Available Online at EScience Press Journals
International Journal of Agricultural Extension
ISSN: 2311-6110 (Online), 2311-8547 (Print)
http://www.esciencepress.net/IJAE

ENSURING THE MARKETING ACTIVITIES OF AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISES: STRATEGIC AND TACTICAL DECISIONS

[a]Alla Riabchyk*, [a]Olena Babicheva, [a]Olena Nahorna, [b]Olena Korchynska, [c]Tamila Bilousko
[a]National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine
[b]Academy of Labour, Social Relations and Tourism, Kyiv, Ukraine
[c]Kharkiv National Agrarian University named after V.V. Dokuchaev, Dokuchayevske-2, Ukraine.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received: April 21, 2021
Revised: July 1, 2021
Accepted: July 30, 2021

Keywords
Differentiation strategy
Farm
Cooperation
Investment
Pricing policy

ABSTRACT

The strategy of agricultural enterprises is transformed under the influence of external requirements. Limited opportunities for agricultural enterprises to adapt to harsh economic and environmental conditions, especially in developing countries, determine strategic opportunities and decisions. The purpose of an article was to study the features of the strategy and tactics of marketing activities of agricultural enterprises to identify their effectiveness in order to support the development of activities. The methodology is based on the theory of strategic decision-making and the concept of sustainable agriculture to identify the effectiveness of strategies and tactics of marketing activities of agricultural firms in Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovenia. The results show a low level of strategic orientation of rural enterprises. State support does little effort to stimulate differentiation and niche specialization of agricultural producers, as evidenced by the constant dynamics of agricultural production. Investing in physical assets is the most effective tool to support the agricultural sector. Cooperation and collaboration among enterprises is not widespread and single-owner farming is the most common organizational form in the agricultural sector. Producers' pricing policies remain stable and depend on market conditions: product prices fluctuated slightly. The practical value of the results lies in taking into account the identified effective ways of state support for agricultural producers in promoting the strategy of differentiation of agricultural products.

Corresponding Author: Alla Riabchyk
Email: ariabchyk6785-19@uoel.uk

INTRODUCTION

The strategy of agricultural enterprises is transformed under the influence of external requirements: strengthening the requirements for quality and certification of products, promotion of healthy lifestyles and organic products, integration of information and communications technology (ICT), the concept of sustainable agriculture and environmental impact, competition, dissemination of cooperation strategies and others. "The agricultural sector is exposed to a variety of risks that occur with high frequency" (Austin and Baharuddin, 2012). Limited opportunities for agricultural enterprises to adapt to harsh economic and environmental conditions, especially in developing countries, determine strategic opportunities and solutions (Pokhrel and Pandey, 2013). Therefore, the literature notes the need to develop strategic marketing decisions (SMDs) based on internal resources, dynamics

of the environment and goals. "Effective strategic marketing decisions of farmers are essential elements in response to market transformation" (Chiamjinnawat, 2017). Since the early 2000s, the concept of sustainability of agricultural organizations has become increasingly widespread, particularly in rural areas, due to growing interest in the development of regional food systems (Campbell, 1997; Ingenbleek and Meulenberg, 2006). From the 1990s to the 2000s, agricultural distribution channels changed, transforming business approaches and developing network structures in the agricultural sector (Rocks *et al.*, 2005).

The transition to organic production and marketing has an impact on the strategic orientations of agricultural enterprises (Press *et al.*, 2014). Promoting the certification of organic agriculture forms is a strategic basis for farmers (Goldberger, 2007). Due to some certain trends, strategic and tactical decisions of enterprises change, become more flexible, require speed of acceptance and response to changes in the external environment. Strategic decisions of agricultural producers relate primarily to joint activities and sales channels (Phillips and Peterson, 2007), which involves studying the conditions of demand, preferences and requirements of consumers and the disadvantages of different distribution channels. There is no thorough study of agricultural marketing in the scientific literature due to assumptions about the homogeneity of farmers' behavior (McLeay *et al.*, 1996). In addition, there is a small scale of operations in the literature of farmers who are not considered as leading players in agri-food value chains (Chiamjinnawat, 2017). The research of the literature for 2000-2020 also proves the lack of a full analysis of strategies and tactics within the marketing activities of agricultural enterprises.

The following types of strategies of agricultural enterprises are discussed in the scientific literature: differentiation, niche strategy and cost leadership strategy (Rossi et al., 2014). The diversification strategy in particular is implemented not only in response to meeting the needs of consumers (Verhees *et al.*, 2012), but also as a way to manage risks in agriculture through the system of natural disasters (Austin and Baharuddin, 2012). The goals of farmers and producers of goods also determine the marketing strategy: supporting households or realizing economic opportunities in the market (Hovorka, 2006). Among the main strategic problems of agricultural enterprises related to competition, decision-making and financial results can highlight the following: lack of strategic planning, marketing processes within the strategy, high financial risks, lack of cooperation and collaboration, low capital, low level of investment in innovation, research and development, incorrect or absent brand positioning, lack of market information, consumer-oriented tactics and lack of established value of agricultural products (Rossi *et al.*, 2014). The goal of this article is to study the strategy features and marketing activities tactics of agricultural enterprises to identify their effectiveness in order to support the development of activities.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This article uses the theory of strategic decision-making (SDMs) (Chiamjinnawat, 2017) and the concept of sustainable agriculture to identify the effectiveness of strategies and tactics of marketing activities of agricultural firms in Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovenia. To determine how the practice of sustainable management affects the effectiveness of marketing strategies and tactics in the market, Eurostat (2020) data for the available period (2010-2016) was used. Strategic and tactical decision-making is a component of agricultural enterprise management. Strategic decisions concern positioning, new product development, strategies, investments and the production process. Tactical decisions involve identifying ways to implement business strategies, including marketing. Tactical decisions mainly determine the structure of the firm, resource allocation, performance indicators, inventories or budget and are made in the course of operating activities (Chiamjinnawat, 2017). To identify strategies and tactics of operational activities of agricultural enterprises used data on the following criteria: 1) efficiency; 2) the practice of land cultivation; 3) human resources; 4) state support; 5) the need for additional activities; 6) production volumes and dynamics of product prices. Agricultural enterprises that forecast market trends, understand future trends, patterns of customer behavior and consumer needs, preferences, subjective norms, ensure the implementation of a winning marketing strategy. Forecasting and planning ensures timely strategic and tactical decisions (Rossi *et al.*, 2014). Purchasing behavior, consumer tastes and preferences can serve as a basis for the development of fundamentally different marketing strategies and tools for promoting agricultural products (Rossi *et al.*, 2014).

The formation of marketing plans within the strategies provides an understanding of consumer satisfaction and strengthening the competitive position in the market by farmers (Larson and Mbowa, 2004).

Cooperation, formation of farmers' alliances, vertical and horizontal cooperation are the most researched issues in the context of studying the strategic marketing activities of the agricultural sector. At the macro level, the need to liberalize government marketing policies to encourage vertical coordination between farmers and other members of the food network and to increase the flow of credit to small agricultural enterprises is being studied (von Braun *et al.*, 2005). At the micro level, it has been proven that cooperation and collaboration is an important strategic decision in order to form an international image in the process of internationalization, human resources development, attracting external financial support to the agricultural sector. Forming strategic alliances is an effective approach to innovation and competitiveness. Such alliances are formed between producers, processors, distributors, wineries, restaurants, hotels (Telfer, 2000).

Strategic groups of farmers in cooperation with a high level of market and entrepreneurial orientation follow the strategy of interaction with customers, increase prices and start new activities. Instead, the low level of market and entrepreneurial orientation of farmers implies the implementation of a strategy to reduce costs and debt burden (Verhees *et al.*, 2012). Thus, differentiation requires higher costs and the production of new types of goods, while the strategy of reducing costs ensures their optimization. The study by McLeay *et al.* (1996) analyzed the processes of strategic management of farms and their marketing, studying the characteristic strategies of groups of farmers. Chiamjinnawat (2017) argues that the collective cooperation of farmers provides increased business potential and productivity of farmers, the ability to analyze market information. “New agriculture” means greater specialization, differentiation, integration into the food system, the formation of strategic alliances and networks (Holmlund and Fulton, 1999).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The structure of the agricultural market of Eastern Europe was transformed in 2010-2016. In Hungary, Poland and Slovenia, the number of farms decreased significantly, while in Romania it almost quadrupled in 2016 (Table 1). At the same time, the area of land in Hungary and Poland remained at the same level; while in Slovenia, it decreased by 1.5 times, and in Romania – increased to 12 million hectares in 2016. Thus, due to the scale of Romania, it was possible to expand agricultural production from 913 million euros in 2010 to 12.105 million euros in 2016. In comparison, Slovenia's output fell to 1.158 million euros (9.874 million euros in 2010). Agricultural output also declined in Poland, while in Hungary it increased by 1.291 million euros. It is worth paying attention to the strategic guidelines for the operation of farms: in Hungary in 2010, 79% of farms produced goods for their own consumption; in 2016, the figure fell to 60%; in Poland the figure was 34% and 18% respectively; in Slovenia – 93% and 57% respectively; in Romania – 60% and 86% respectively. Thus, the strategies of farms in Hungary, Poland and Slovenia are to enter the market and sell products, while Romanian farms are focused on meeting their own consumer needs within the domestic market, which means the potential to increase household income through agricultural development. In the practice of agriculture, farmers mainly carry out conventional land cultivation (Table 2). In Poland in 2010, most land remained uncultivated for 1 season, a significant share is cultivated by conventional methods and zero land cultivation occupies a small share in all countries. In 2016, in Hungary, Romania and Poland, 43%, 38% and 47% of land were cultivated by conventional methods, while about 50% of land remained uncultivated for one season. In Slovenia during 2010-2016, 88% of land was cultivated by conventional methods. This means a lack of innovative technologies and strategies to ensure sustainable agricultural development. In Hungary, 91% of the workforce is employed on a permanent basis, Sole holder hires 44%, 22% are family members, 24% are employees, 9% are part-time employees and 46% are farm managers (Table 3). In Poland, the structure of employees differs: 97% work on a permanent basis, of which only 7% are not family members and only 3% work irregularly. The situation is similar in Romania and Slovenia: 94% and 95% respectively work regularly, 4% and 3% of non-family workers, respectively, are employed regularly, 6% and 5% work non-regularly. Thus, farming strategies are almost homogeneous and do not optimize labor costs, despite the seasonality of agricultural work.

Table 1. Farm indicators by agricultural area, type of farm, standard output, legal form, euro (2010, 2016)

	Hungary	Poland	Slovenia	Romania
	2010			
Farm – number	576 810	1 506 620	3 859 040	74 650
Utilized agricultural area – hectare	4 686 340	14 447 290	13 306 130	482 650
Farm area excluding special agricultural production areas – hectare	7 102 970	16 982 340	15 695 030	905 990
Farms with livestock – number	381 650	918 870	2 836 640	59 220
Farms with livestock – livestock unit	2 483 790	10 377 220	5 444 180	518 480
Standard output – euro	5 241 037 240	18 987 070 900	9 874 585 200	913 194 010
Farms whose household consumes more than 50% of the final production – number	453 670	510 840	3 589 530	44 430
	2016			
Farm – number	430 000	1 410 700	69 900	3 422 030
Utilized agricultural area – hectare	4 670 560	14 405 650	488 400	12 502 540
Farm area excluding special agricultural production areas – hectare	6 245 770	16 236 200	906 460	13 864 510
Farms with livestock – number	261 540	718 240	56 580	2 567 430
Farms with livestock – livestock unit	2 444 890	9 443 240	512 120	4 828 780
Standard output – euro	6 532 474 660	25 005 635 420	1 158 773 470	12 105 491 800
Farms whose household consumes more than 50% of the final production – number	257 100	259 000	40 150	2 956 380

Table 2. Agricultural practices, hectare, 2010, 2016

	Arable land	Arable land excluding tillage	Conventional tillage	Conservative tillage	Zero tillage
		2010			
Hungary	-	-	3 205 710	313 580	44 170
Poland	-	-	3 616 400	466 670	403 180
Romania	8 306 420	652 370	6 877 700	192 530	583 820
Slovenia	-	-	128 890	14 690	2 480
		2016			
Hungary	3 821 830	170 560	3 256 560	356 770	37 940
Poland	10 805 610	160 640	10 121 640	296 630	226 700
Romania	7 813 430	951 930	5 906 190	217 340	737 980
Slovenia	-	-	142 810	19 270	920

Table 3. Labor force main indicators, 2016 annual working unit (AWU).

2016	Total	Farm labor force, directly employed by the farm on a regular basis	Sole holder directly employed by the farm	Members of sole holders' family, excluding the holder, directly employed by the farm	Non-family farm labor force, directly employed by the farm on a regular basis	Farm labor force, directly employed by the farm on a non-regular basis	Farm manager, excluding group holding
Hungary	394 410	357 230	171 970	88 700	96 560	37 190	180 230
Poland	1 649 400	1 600 320	833 260	657 430	109 640	49 080	856 760
Romania	1 640 120	1 539 480	828 220	652 180	59 080	100 640	838 930
Slovenia	82 390	78 450	34 660	41 470	2 320	3 940	36 840

The level of support for rural development within the countries of Eastern Europe deserves special attention (Table 4). In accordance with European Union (EU) policies and standards, Member States must ensure product certification, in particular to guarantee product specificities, specific farming methods and the quality of final products, certification and quality monitoring schemes by regulatory authorities. Quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs (Regulation (EU) No. 1151/2012…, 2012) may include reimbursement of advertising and marketing costs of farms carried out by groups of agricultural producers. These standards are intended to provide support to producers through the reduction of asymmetric competition in the market, reducing the level of discrimination against certain types of products. Only Poland actively carries out certification and product quality assurance: in 2016, support for certification schemes amounted to 890 million euros, in Slovenia – 3.9 million euros. 97% of support was provided to farms managed by a sole holder (860.5 million euros); 2% support was received by Farm managed by spouse of holder (15.4 million euros); 1% – Farm managed by a family member (not spouse) of holder (10.6 million euros).

Table 4. Support for rural development by legal status, size and farm typology, 2016 (euro).

	Hungary	Poland	Romania	Slovenia
Quality schemes for agricultural products, and foodstuffs (article 16)				
Total, euro	-	890 988 340	-	3 899 750
Legal person	-	1 612 800	-	-
Group holding	-	-	-	-
Farm managed by sole holder	-	860 487 000	-	2 530 860
Farm managed by spouse of holder	-	15 416 950	-	-
Farm managed by a family member (not spouse) of holder	-	10 615 390	-	-
Farm not managed by any family member of holder	-	2 856 190	-	-
Investment in physical assets (article 17)				
Total	1 661 627 830	233 138 180	-	84 603 830
Legal person	1 279 224 810	-	-	45 020 460
Group holding	-	-	-	-
Farm managed by sole holder	376 560 270	231 422 690	-	36 116 820
Farm managed by spouse of holder	967 790	1 715 490	-	1 031 730
Farm managed by a family member (not spouse) of holder	3 933 290	-	-	2 305 500
Farm not managed by any family member of holder	941 660	-	-	-
Agri-environment-climate (article 28)				
Total	768 322 440	2 188 213 680	643 958 070	553 626 750
Legal person	581 854 730	15 939 250	257 236 220	76 824 180
Group holding	-	-	-	-
Farm managed by sole holder	179 594 730	2 113 965 510	380 292 820	432 469 550
Farm managed by spouse of holder	1 967 980	27 669 110	2 750 360	18 093 540
Farm managed by a family member (not spouse) of holder	3 637 360	14 232 760	3 601 790	25 904 180
Farm not managed by any family member of holder	1 267 640	16 407 060	-	335 300
Organic farming (article 29)				
Total	1 213 640	1 038 516 900	64 130 170	110 267 320
Legal person	-	1 674 890	40 301 390	33 124 890
Group holding	-	-	-	-
Farm managed by sole holder	706 290	1 002 100 920	23 707 100	70 378 340
Farm managed by spouse of holder	-	16 742 360	33 260	2 996 870
Farm managed by a family member (not spouse) of holder	-	10 349 540	88 410	3 637 890

Farm not managed by any family member of holder	-	7 649 200	-	-

Group holdings did not receive any support. Such a strategy provides assistance and stimulation of production of quality certified products and increase the level of diversity of products of the agricultural sector. Investment in physical assets is one of the instruments of state support for farmers, which is particularly used in Hungary. This instrument provides 50% of funding for the acquisition of assets of the most backward areas, where the level of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita was less than the EU average; 75% of asset financing in outermost regions; 40% of investments in farm assets in other regions. Support is provided to new farms; to finance collective investments and integrated projects (producer associations); regions with various restrictions; for processing and marketing of certain types of products. For example, 77% of investments were received by Legal person in Hungary, 23% – Farm managed by sole holder. In Poland, 99% of investment returns were received by Farm managed by sole holder. In Slovenia, the reimbursement structure was as follows: 53% – Legal person, 43% – Farm managed by sole holder, 3% – Farm managed by a family member (not spouse) of holder. Thus, at the national level, governments implement a policy of implementing differentiated production strategies by farmers by providing support to those producers who are engaged in technologically complex and costly agricultural activities, especially in backward rural areas. Agri-environment-climate (Regulation (EU) No. 1151/2012…, 2012) measures a significant amount of funds in all countries, but the funding structure differs significantly. In Hungary, 76% of Agri-environment-climate activities funded by Legal person, 23% of activities implemented by Farm managed by sole holder. In Poland, 97% of funding came from Farm managed by sole holder, while in Romania – 59%, Slovenia – 78%.

Instead, Romania allocated 40% of funds for Legal person events, Slovenia – 14% for Legal person events, 3% for Farm managed by spouse of holder events, 5% for Farm managed by a family member (not spouse) of holder events. It should be noted that these measures include the cultivation of annual crops, specialized perennial crops and various types of land use. Organic farming is also funded by the state. Poland is a leader in the development of organic farming, which provides support for the cultivation of annual crops and specialized perennial crops.

Producers and farmers differentiate agricultural activities to obtain additional income (Table 5). In Hungary, agriculture was engaged in other activities, in addition to the main one for income diversification, the income from which amounted to 21%. In Poland, the figure was only 1%, in Romania – 12%, in Slovenia – 16%. In addition to the main activity, enterprises received income from secondary activities: 8% in Hungary, 2% in Poland, 10% in Romania and 18% in Slovenia. However, the majority of agricultural owners do not receive income from other activities and do not engage in secondary activities: 71% in Hungary, 98% in Poland, 78% in Romania and 65% in Slovenia. Thus, the most homogeneous and homogeneous activities are engaged in agricultural enterprises in Poland,

Table 5. Other gainful activities, euro, 2016.

	Holder having other gainful activities as main activity	Holder having other gainful activities as secondary activity	Holder not having other gainful activities
Hungary	879 038 690	335 923 640	3 043 586 140
Poland	163 992 550	339 032 470	21 913 069 390
Romania	1 323 392 250	1 030 968 340	8 261 202 450
Slovenia	221 007 940	244 175 860	880 681 690

In general, agricultural production in all countries decreased in 2011-2020 (Table 6). Despite the sharp growth of Romanian farms and output in monetary terms, the country's output declined at the fastest pace – by 50% in ten years. The lowest rate of agar production decreased in Hungary, which actively invests in physical assets of agricultural enterprises and provides financing cultivation of annual crops and specialized perennials. Instead, production in Poland and Slovenia fell by 22% and 25%, respectively. If compare the production

volumes of 2019 with 2011, the reduction occurred in Poland and Slovenia by 15% and 19%, respectively. In general, countries support the production of the agricultural sector through various mechanisms.

Table 6. Economic accounts for agriculture – values at current prices (production value at basic price, million euro).

Geo/Time	2011	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Growth, %
Hungary	3.858.78	3.725.80	3.506.82	3.885.20	4.004.22	3.240.11	-16.03%
Poland	8.729.64	6.585.64	7.646.75	6.843.63	7.440.45	6.777.03	-22.37%
Romania	7.544.14	5.833.43	6.933.90	7.864.11	7.915.38	3.776.23	-49.94%
Slovenia	164.22	126.34	119.43	124.43	130.11	123.80	-24.61%

Annual sales prices of crop products averaged 15.82 euros per 100 kg of product with a deviation of 2.29 euros per 100 kg of products for 2011-2019 in Hungary, 17.14 euros per 100 kg of products (deviation 2.28 euros per 100 kg of products) in Poland, 16.64 euros per 100 kg of products (2.65 euros per 100 kg of products) in Romania, 16.53 (2.11 euros per 100 kg of products) in Slovenia. This means a weak level of differentiation of prices for agricultural products. Thus, farms Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovenia generally implement similar production strategies aimed at meeting their own needs (except for Poland, which provides financing to the agricultural sector to develop the domestic market and stimulate exports), differentiation and niche strategies through public stimulating the cultivation of annual crops and specialized perennial crops.

The study once again confirms the conclusion about the homogeneity of farmers' behavior (McLeay *et al.*, 1996), despite the active state support and stimulation of niche specialization. The most common form of management is single-owner farmers and therefore small-scale operations of agar enterprises have been proven, which cannot ensure the formation of agri-food value chains (Chiamjinnawat, 2017). This form of organization of activity cannot provide a dynamic growth of production, but only aimed at meeting the needs of producers to a greater extent. The exception is Poland, where only 18% of enterprises produced goods for their own consumption. The research proves that the most common strategies are differentiation strategy and niche strategy (Rossi *et al.*, 2014). These strategies are actively stimulated by the state through the financing of physical assets, support for the cultivation of annual crops and specialized perennials. In Poland, a diversification strategy that is stimulated at the national level in accordance with international standards and EU regulations[1] is implemented not only in response to customer needs (Verhees *et al.*, 2012), but also as a way to manage agricultural risks and support organic farming (Austin and Baharuddin, 2012). Thus, it was found that only 1% of the income of enterprises in Poland was received from additional activities. Level of differentiation of activity of the enterprises of Hungary, Slovenia and Romania are much larger.

The marketing strategy of Hungary, Slovenia and Romania is mainly determined by the goals of farmers and food producers in meeting the needs of households or the realization of economic opportunities in the market (Hovorka, 2006). This strategy is especially pronounced in Romania, where the number of enterprises has sharply increased, production volumes and the share of production for own needs was 86%. Reducing the level of asymmetric distorted competition is a major problem in the strategic activities of agricultural enterprises. The second identified problem is the lack of cooperation and collaboration, low level of investment in innovation, research and development. Given the priority in meeting their own needs, it can be assumed that the farms of Hungary, Slovenia and Romania do not implement tactics, consumer-oriented, the lack of established value of agricultural products (Rossi *et al.*, 2014). It can also be assumed that there is a lack of understanding of the model of consumer behavior and consumer needs, preferences, subjective norms, which determine the lack of stability of the agricultural sector and fluctuations in production. Therefore, agricultural enterprises in these countries are not able to ensure the development of fundamentally

[1] Regulation (EU) No. 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council "On quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs". 2012. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32012R1151

different marketing strategies and tools to promote agricultural products (Šedík *et al.*, 2018).

According to this study, cooperation and collaboration is a rare practice in Poland, Hungary, Slovenia and Romania. As well as the research of J. von Braun, A. Gulati, P. Hazell, M.W. Rosegrant, M. Ruel (2005), demonstrate the importance of liberalizing government-marketing policy to encourage vertical coordination between farmers and other food network participants. Agricultural enterprises mainly retain regular staff; involve family members in production processes. Given the satisfaction of their own needs, most companies are less focused on foreign markets and human resources development, attracting external financial support to the agricultural sector (Telfer, 2000). However, in Poland and Hungary, companies are actively attracting government support in the form of investments in assets, financing the cultivation of annual crops and specialized perennials. Thus, due to the fact that differentiation requires higher costs and the production of new types of products, agricultural enterprises make little effort, despite the understanding of the threats and risks of the environment. "New agriculture" since the discussion in the scientific literature and the emergence of the concept in the late 1990s does not increase the level of specialization, differentiation, integration into the food system, the formation of strategic alliances and networks (Holmlund and Fulton, 1999). This proves the conclusions of (Pokhrel and Pandey, 2013) about the limited ability of agar companies to adapt to harsh economic and environmental conditions, especially in developing countries. Therefore, the strategic and tactical decisions of most agricultural producers are limited.

CONCLUSIONS

The study proves the low level of strategic orientation of agricultural enterprises. State support does little to stimulate differentiation and niche specialization of agricultural producers, as evidenced by the constant dynamics of agricultural production. The exception is investment in physical assets, which are most effective as a tool to support the agricultural sector in Hungary. Cooperation and collaboration among enterprises is not widespread, and single-owner farming is the most common organizational form in the agricultural sector. Farms have little focus on cost-cutting strategies, as they attract labor on a regular basis. Producers' pricing policies remain stable and depend on market conditions: product prices fluctuated slightly.

Farms Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovenia generally implements similar production strategies to meet its own needs (except for Poland, which provides financing for the agricultural sector to develop the domestic market and stimulate exports), differentiation and niche strategies through government incentives for growing annual crops and specialized perennials. The identified features of the strategic behavior of agar enterprises should be taken into account when optimizing the methods of state support for agricultural producers. Given the popularization of the strategy of differentiation of agricultural products in the analyzed countries, niche specialized orientation of producers in the development of organic production and sustainable agriculture, it is advisable to focus on the state policy of financing physical assets.

REFERENCES

Austin, O. C. and A. H. Baharuddin. 2012. Risk in Malaysian agriculture: the need for a strategic approach and a policy refocus. Kajian Malaysia: Journal of Malaysian Studies, 30.

Campbell, D. 1997. Community-controlled economic development as a strategic vision for the sustainable agriculture movement. American Journal of Alternative Agriculture, 12: 37-44.

Chiamjinnawat, B. 2017. Factors affecting strategic marketing decisions in agriculture: a study of fruit farmers in Thailand: a thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Agribusiness at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand. (Unpublished) thesis, Massey University.

Eurostat. 2020. Eurostat. 2020. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database.

Goldberger, J. R. 2007. Non-governmental organizations, strategic bridge building, and the "scientization" of organic agriculture in Kenya. Agriculture and Human Values, 25: 271-289.

Holmlund, M. and M. E. Fulton. 1999. Networking for success: Strategic alliances in the new agriculture.

Hovorka, A. J. 2006. Urban agriculture: addressing practical and strategic gender needs. Development in Practice, 16: 51-61.

Ingenbleek, P. and M. T. G. Meulenberg. 2006. The battle between "good" and "better": A strategic

marketing perspective on codes of conduct for sustainable agriculture. Agribusiness, 22: 451-473.

Larson, D. W. and S. Mbowa. 2004. Strategic marketing problems in the Uganda maize seed industry. International Food and Agribusiness Management Review, 7: 86-93.

McLeay, F., S. Martin and T. Zwart. 1996. Farm business marketing behavior and strategic groups in agriculture. Agribusiness, 12: 339-351.

Phillips, J. C. and H. C. Peterson. 2007. Strategic marketing decisions for organic agricultural producers. International food and agribusiness management review, 10.

Pokhrel, D. M. and B. Pandey. 2013. Climate Change Adaptation: Strategic Vision In Agriculture. Journal of Agriculture and Environment, 12: 104-112.

Press, M., E. J. Arnould, J. B. Murray and K. Strand. 2014. Ideological Challenges to Changing Strategic Orientation in Commodity Agriculture. Journal of Marketing, 78: 103-119.

Rocks, S., A. Gilmore and D. Carson. 2005. Developing strategic marketing through the use of marketing networks. Journal of Strategic Marketing, 13: 81-92.

Rossi, M., D. Vrontis and A. Thrassou. 2014. Agro business in a changing competitive environment - Campania firms' strategic, marketing and financial choices. World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development, 10: 312.

Šedík, P., E. Horská, B. Skowron-Grabowska and C. B. Illés. 2018. Generation marketing in strategic marketing management: case study of honey market. Polish Journal of Management Studies, 18: 326-337.

Telfer, D. J. 2000. Tastes of Niagara. International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 1: 71-88.

Verhees, F. J. H. M., T. Lans and J. A. A. M. Verstegen. 2012. The influence of market and entrepreneurial orientation on strategic marketing choices: the cases of Dutch farmers and horticultural growers. Journal on Chain and Network Science, 12: 167-179.

von Braun, J., A. Gulati, P. Hazell, M. W. Rosegrant and M. Ruel. 2005. Indian agriculture and rural development Strategic issues and reform options. International Food Policy Research Institute.